REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 14, 2009. Claims 1-2 remain in this application. In view of the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office rejects Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0019526 – Takeda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,087 – Schell. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 are allowable

The cited portions of Takeda and Schell, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Takeda fail to disclose or suggest, "*wherein gain of the feed-forward loop is chosen such that an angular velocity of the tray motor is proportional to the input voltage*", as recited in claims 1 and 2. As admitted by the Office at page 3 of the Office Action, Takeda is silent about the utilization of a motor current feed-forward loop. The Office states, "Takeda is silent about said sliding means includes, for the tray steering, **a motor current feed-forward loop** comprising ……".

The cited portions of Schell fail to disclose or suggest, "*wherein gain of the feed-forward loop is chosen such that an angular velocity of the tray motor is proportional to the input voltage*", as recited in claims 1 and 2. Instead, the cited portions of Schell disclose an optical disc system for writing information onto a storage medium having a focusing mechanism and a tracking mechanism controlled by a feedback loop. See Schell, col. 11, lines 9-26. The Office further cites Schell at cols. 67 and 76 for teaching circuitry comprising resistors, amplifiers and adders. Notwithstanding the teaching of circuitry comprising resistors, amplifiers and adders, it appears that Schell discloses a feedback loop for the express purpose of controlling a focusing mechanism and tracking mechanism. Schell at Fig. 112 describes the power stage of an actuator for the coarse radial movement of the objective lens. The power stage consists of two power amplifiers, the lower amplifier being the master

(11,12,20) and the upper being the slave, wherein the slave is driven by the output of the master (11,12,20). The master (11,12,20) amplifier has no direct voltage feedback. Instead, the master (11,12,20) amplifier obtains its feedback from the current in the actuator. This current is measured by the op-amp (5,6,7). Because this is **a current feedback system,** the polarity of the feedback is negative. That is, a high current is counteracted by making the output voltage of the power stage lower. It is respectfully submitted that the **current feedback system** of Schell is **different** from the **current feed-forward system** of the invention. To convert the current feedback system of Schell into the current feed-forward system of the invention a number of non-obvious changes need to be made. These changes include, (1) adding a direct voltage feedback for the master amplifier (11, 12, 20), (2) altering the polarity of the current measuring circuitry, and (3) adjusting its gain to obtain a stable and effective current feed-forward. Therefore, it is shown, such a disclosure cannot be said to anticipate the limitations set forth in the claims. Accordingly, Schell does not appear to disclose, suggest, or provide motivation for the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 2.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Takeda and Schell, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest "*wherein gain of the feed-forward loop is chosen such that an angular velocity of the tray motor is proportional to the input voltage*", as recited in claims 1 and 2. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 2 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 and 2 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-945-6000.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001